

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

KOURIOCKEIN VANN,

Plaintiff,

-against-

WOLFE-FRIEDMAN, et al,

Defendants.

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: _____
DATE FILED: 7/2/2025

7:23-cv-236 (NSR)

ORDER

NELSON S. ROMÁN, United States District Judge:

The Court is in receipt of Defendants Mikail Gusman, Yelena Korobkova and Janice Wolfe-Friedman's application (ECF 44) seeking the Court dismiss with prejudice *pro se* Plaintiff Kouriockein Vann's ("Plaintiff") First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 9), as *pro se* Plaintiff has failed to file a Second Amended Complaint within the time allotted by the Court.

Specifically, in its Opinion & Order dated January 6, 2025 (ECF No. 39), the Court granted Defendants' motion to dismiss *pro se* Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint in its entirety, without prejudice. *Pro se* Plaintiff was advised that if he did not file a Second Amended Complaint, the First Amended Complaint would be dismissed with prejudice. *Pro se* Plaintiff was directed to file his Second Amended Complaint by February 24, 2025. (ECF No. 39.) *Pro se* Plaintiff filed letters on February 11, 2025, and March 3, 2025 (ECF Nos. 40 and 41, respectively) requesting extensions of time to file his Second Amended Complaint, which the Court granted, ultimately giving *pro se* Plaintiff until June 2, 2025, to file his Second Amended Complaint. (ECF No. 43.)

To date, it has been a month since the date *pro se* Plaintiff was directed to file his Second Amended Complaint and *pro se* Plaintiff has failed to do so. *Pro se* Plaintiff has likewise not sought an extension of time beyond the June 2, 2025, deadline. It is axiomatic that "[w]hen a plaintiff does not correct the defects in an initial pleading through the filing of a more detailed amended

complaint . . . [the] complaint may be dismissed with prejudice.” *Liner v. Goord*, 115 F. Supp. 2d 432, 434 (S.D.N.Y. 2000). This is especially the case where the court has afforded the plaintiff multiple opportunities and extensions to file an amended pleading, and the plaintiff decides against doing so. *Id.* See also *Shcherb v. Angi Homeservices Inc.*, No. 1:19-CV-367-MKV, 2020 WL 2571041, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. May 21, 2020) (dismissing with prejudice complaint where plaintiff made no effort to correct the defects in his claims). Accordingly, the Court dismisses with prejudice *pro se* Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint and directs the Clerk of Court to terminate the instant action.

The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to mail a copy of this Order to *pro se* Plaintiff at the address listed on ECF and to show service on the docket.

Dated: July 2, 2025
White Plains, New York

SO ORDERED:



NELSON S. ROMÁN
United States District Judge